

Application Serial No. 10/675,088  
Reply to office action of April 25, 2007

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

PATENT  
JUL 10 2007 Docket: CU-3336

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-13, 15-16 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. patent D493,587 to Downey et. al and U.S. patent 5,524,321 to Weaver et al.

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Downey* and *Weaver* in view of U.S. patent 6,859,975 to Ohta et al.

The applicant has amended claim 1 such that it avoids *Downey*, *Weaver* and *Ohta*. Many of the limitations added to claim 1 by this amendment were found in original claims 12 and 15, so claims 12 and 15 have been cancelled.

Paraphrased, claim 1 recites that the "connecting portion" of the frame assembly, which is identified in the figures by reference numeral 155, includes one or both of a "guiding member that protrudes upwardly from the connecting portion" of the vacuum cleaner, and a "convex seating guide." The guiding member is identified in the figures by reference numeral 199. The convex seating guide is identified in the figures by reference numeral 250.

Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found in the specification on page 13, line 13 through line 8 of page 14. The figures also support the claim amendments. No new matter has been added.

On page 4 of the office action, the Examiner asserted that *Weaver* disclosed a first guiding member that had been claimed in original claim 12. The office action included a drawing on page 6, which was obtained from *Weaver* and annotated with a text block that identified the projection 204 of *Weaver* as being the guiding member/seating guide that had been claimed in original claims 12 and 15.

Application Serial No. 10/675,088  
Reply to office action of April 25, 2007


PATENT  
Docket: CU-3336

The applicant acknowledges that the structure in *Weaver* that is identified by reference numeral 204 might arguably satisfy limitations of original claims 12 and 15, however, claim 1 has been further narrowed to recite both a guiding member and to recite a convex seating guide. No reference or combination of references shows or suggests a guide member and a seating guide that is also convex.

Since no reference or combination of references shows or suggests each and every one of the limitations of claim 1, the claim is in condition for allowance. Since claim 1 is in condition for allowance, claims that depend from claim 1 are *also* in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Sincerely,

Dated: July 10, 2007

  
Joseph P. Krause, Reg. No. 32,578  
Ladas & Parry LLP  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300